

brokers reported in the 1954 Census of Wholesalers. Benchmark totals for 1954 were extrapolated to 1959 on the basis of the change in output in such industries from 1954 to 1959.

Retail trade: Total employment in retail establishments dependent on wheat and related products was based on employment data reported in the 1958 Census of Retail Trade. The total number of employees reported for retail bakeries was assumed to be completely dependent on wheat. For grocery stores, an estimated 9 percent of all employees was allocated to wheat and wheat products, based on the assumption that wheat-related employment was proportional to sales of wheat and wheat products in retail grocery stores. Wheat-related employment in eating and drinking places and, hay, feed and grain stores was derived on the basis of the ratio of the value of wheat and wheat products purchased to total materials purchased by such establishments, as shown by the 1947 BLS Interindustry Relations Study.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Ohio, and ask unanimous consent that it not be taken out of the time on the resolution.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, several times during this so-called bobtail session of the Congress I have suggested that a serious mistake would be committed unless Congress passed legislation giving the Secretary of State discretionary powers within the mandate declared by the Supreme Court of the United States regarding the issuance of passports.

In 1958 the Supreme Court rendered a decision which completely removed from the Secretary of State any control over the right to deny passports regardless of the character of the individual who applies for one. It has been pointed out that Communists can apply for passports and obtain them. They can go to the Soviet and deliver to Moscow whatever information they desire. The Secretary of State can do nothing about such practices.

We have been in session since August 8. Several times this subject has been discussed on the floor of the Senate, and yet nothing has been done toward presenting a bill for discussion, and thus affording Senators an opportunity to pass upon it.

I am a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, before which bills are pending. A representative of the Communist League of the United States appeared before that committee and protested against the passage of the bill. The representatives of other agencies which are not strictly within the same category appeared to testify.

The bill has not yet been reported out of committee. There is one bill on the calendar which deals with the same subject that has not been called up for consideration.

I should like to make this query of my associates in the Senate. A bill subsidizing the mining of zinc and lead was called up for discussion, debate, and was finally passed. Compared with the proposed bill on passports, of what significance to the safety of the Nation has a bill to subsidize the lead and the zinc mining industries?

With due respect to my colleague from the State of Michigan [Mr. HARR], he has had brought before the Senate for consideration a resolution on which there will be 3 hours of debate, and which contemplates a request that the President of the United States not make appointments to the Supreme Court during the recess.

I shall not argue about the propriety of the proposal of the Senator from Michigan, but I do ask this question. For more than 150 years there has been no such resolution or proposal made. What is the emergency nature of such a proposal? What has happened that the question should now be considered so seriously, and requiring treatment in this special session, while the bill to which I referred dealing with Communists remains at sleep, with nothing being done about it?

Some explanation will have to be made to the question of why we gave the utmost of consideration to matters that could have waited until next January, and yet we declined to listen to the plea of the Secretary of State, who repeatedly has said, "I need this legislation. Please pass it."

What tremendous power is operating upon the Senate? Who is it that possesses the influence to see to it that such bill is not brought up for consideration?

I wish to commend the Senator from Nebraska for his effort to get the bill before the Senate. I observe he has not succeeded up to this time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, and I shall yield him a couple of additional minutes if necessary?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The distinguished Senator from Nebraska brought this subject to our attention very forcibly.

On Friday, August 26, I placed in the RECORD a letter from the Acting Secretary of State, Douglas Dillon, which emphatically asked for passport legislation at this session, and said this was a matter of the utmost concern. Under Secretary of State Dillon indicated that there is a clear and present danger to this country unless we enact this proposed legislation to give him some authority in this field.

There is on the calendar a bill which is Calendar No. 1881, Senate bill 2652. This bill was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DONN] and myself jointly and has been reported out of the Committee on the Judiciary. Long hearings dealing with this problem were held and, as I said on the floor, if the bill needs amendment, if it does not give enough rights to the individuals affected, we can take whatever action is necessary on the floor of the Senate to improve it.

The bill deals not only with the problem stated by the Senator from Ohio, but several others to meet the Communist menace in this country in, I believe, an effective but fair, realistic, objective, and judicial manner.

I am very happy that the distinguished Senator from Ohio has called attention to the necessity for this proposed legisla-

tion today, and it is my earnest hope that we shall be able to consider it before the session ends.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am sorry that I was not present last Friday when the Senator from New York made his presentation on this subject. What he has stated reemphasizes the proposal that I have submitted to the Senate. How can the Senate consider as important many of the subjects that have come before us, while at the same time, in effect, declare as unimportant a bill about which the Secretary of State has said the failure of adoption would constitute a danger and a menace to our country?

We have been waiting 3 years. No action has been taken. I wish to repeat again that the headman of the Communist association of the United States testified. I was present. He testified that the bill should not be passed, because the right to travel is just as sacred as the right to worship God, the right to enjoy free speech, a jury trial, freedom of assembly, and all the other rights declared in the Constitution. To him we listen. To the Secretary of State we turn a deaf ear. That is about the sum and substance of the whole matter. [Applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The occupants of the galleries will refrain from any manifestations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, am I correct in understanding that we are now proceeding under a limitation of time for debate on the unfinished business, the resolution opposing the making of recess appointments to the Supreme Court?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; but another unanimous-consent request has been entered into, eliminating the present portion of the debate from the operation of that limitation.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3313) to amend section 200 of the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act of 1940 to permit the establishment of certain facts by a declaration under penalty of perjury in lieu of an affidavit.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10960) to amend section 5701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the excise tax upon cigars; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MILLS, Mr. FORAND, Mr. KING of California, Mr. MASON, and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12536) relating to the treatment of charges for local advertising for purposes of determining the manufacturers

sale price; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MILLS, Mr. FORAND, Mr. KING of California, Mr. MASON, and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12659) to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MILLS, Mr. FORAND, Mr. KING of California, Mr. MASON, and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, RELATING TO EXCISE TAX ON CIGARS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10960) to amend section 5701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the excise tax upon cigars, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. TALMADGE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. KERR, Mr. FREAR, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CARLSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

TREATMENT OF CHARGES FOR LOCAL ADVERTISING FOR PURPOSES OF DETERMINING THE MANUFACTURERS SALE PRICE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12536) relating to the treatment of charges for local advertising for purposes of determining the manufacturers sale price, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. TALMADGE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. KERR, Mr. FREAR, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CARLSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF IMPORT DUTY ON HEPTANOIC ACID

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the

House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12659) to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. TALMADGE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. KERR, Mr. FREAR, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CARLSON managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, may we have a brief explanation of the matters involved?

Mr. TALMADGE. In the three cases just acted on amendments were added in the Senate on Saturday night. The House has asked for a conference. I have moved that the Senate insist on its amendments, agree to the conference requested by the House, and that the Chair appoint conferees.

FOREIGN SERVICE ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1960—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2633) to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of August 26, 1960, pp. 16631-16637, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a brief explanation of the conference report on S. 2633. I hope the conference report will be agreed to.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 2633

I should like to speak briefly in explanation of the conference report on S. 2633, the Foreign Service Act Amendments of 1960.

The Senate passed S. 2633 a year ago on September 9, 1959. The Senate bill made numerous changes in the administration of the Foreign Service and the Department of State. A new class structure for Foreign Service staff personnel was provided. The Foreign Service retirement and disability system was liberalized in conformity with the civil service retirement system. Improvements were made in the recruitment and training of Foreign Service officers. Functional and geographic area specification by Foreign Service officers was encouraged. An

increase in the authorization of appropriations for the Foreign Service buildings fund was approved.

On August 22, 1960, the House passed S. 2633 with amendments. Most of these amendments were of a technical perfecting nature and for the most part were readily acceptable to the Senate conferees.

There were six matters of greater substance which were in disagreement.

1. REVISION OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE STAFF CLASS STRUCTURE

The Senate bill would have decreased the number of classes for staff personnel from 22 to 10. Classes 15 through 22 under the present structure have not been used for a number of years. The smaller number of classes would rationalize administration of the staff corps.

The House bill eliminated this revision of the staff class structure. The conferees agreed that owing to the recent 7½-percent pay increase the proposed salary levels in the revised class structure ought to be reexamined and the conferees expect that the Department will submit legislation next year for consideration.

2. AUTHORIZATION OF 15-PERCENT EXTRA PAY FOR COURIERS

The Senate version of S. 2633 would have permitted the Secretary to establish rates of extra pay for couriers not to exceed 15 percent of their basic salary. This was justified on an analogy to the various kinds of hazardous duty in the armed services which is compensated for by extra pay. The House bill eliminated the provision. The conferees agreed to its deletion pending further study.

3. AUTHORIZATION OF A WASHINGTON HOUSING ALLOWANCE FOR FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS

The Senate bill authorized a modest differential to be applied to the basic salary of Foreign Service officers assigned to duty in the United States, according to the number of their dependents. This provision was designed to give the same kind of financial help to Foreign Service officers assigned to Washington as has long been given to military officers in the same circumstances. The housing allowance is necessary because Foreign Service officers spend the greater part of their careers overseas and when they come to Washington for relatively short periods they have many additional expenses largely related to housing. The House bill eliminated this housing allowance.

The House conferees agreed on the desirability of a Washington housing allowance for Foreign Service officers, but the conference gave careful consideration to the opposition to such an allowance which has been expressed by the members of the House Appropriations Committee and by the Bureau of the Budget. While discussing this opposition a message was received by the conferees from the Department of State indicating that the President might veto S. 2633 if the housing allowance stayed in the bill. The conferees greatly resented this unwarranted interference in the legislative process. In view, however, of the apparent lack of understanding of the need for a Washington housing allowance, the conferees reluctantly decided to eliminate the provision rather than jeopardize other important advances which would be secured by the bill.

4. AUTHORIZATION OF INCENTIVE PAY FOR LEARNING ESOTERIC FOREIGN LANGUAGES

The Senate bill authorized the Secretary of State to provide special monetary incentives to encourage the acquisition or retention of proficiency in esoteric foreign languages or other special abilities needed in the Foreign Service. The House bill eliminated this provision. The Senate conferees persuaded the House conferees that the extra push which this provision would give to the Department's accelerated programs of language training would be helpful. The in-

1960

clusion of this incentive provision complements another provision of the bill according to which the Secretary of State is required to designate every Foreign Service officer position in a foreign country, the incumbent of which should have a useful knowledge of the language of the country. After a 5-year period to allow for increased training in a foreign language, such designated position can be filled only by a qualified linguist. The conferees believe that the achievement of such a high standard of competence is already overdue.

5. ELIMINATION OF FREE OFFICIAL SERVICES TO AMERICAN VESSELS AND SEAMEN

The Senate bill would amend existing laws which now prohibit charging of fees by consular officers for official services to American vessels and seamen. The conferees were of the opinion that the establishing of a reasonable schedule of fees for such services is appropriate, but also felt that it would be more appropriate to have this subject handled in separate legislation.

6. INCREASE IN AUTHORIZATION FOR FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICE SPACE

The Senate version of S. 2633 would have increased by \$100 million (of which \$50 million was in foreign currencies) the appropriations authorized for the purpose of erecting office buildings and other buildings needed by U.S. missions overseas. The House bill eliminated this increased authorization. The conferees decided that further study ought to be given to the Department's proposed 5-year buildings program before the full program is authorized. They agreed upon an increase in the authorization of \$10 million, an amount which it was felt would enable the current program to continue without interruption.

I believe that this product of the conference which I have described is an excellent one. I believe that the changes in the Foreign Service contained in the bill will, if they are administered wisely by the Department of State, help to achieve a better quality of representation of the U.S. interests abroad.

I hope that the conference report on S. 2633 will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

THE CONGO AND POLICY TOWARD THE NEW AFRICA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, hopes rise and fall with respect to developments in the Congo. A road to an orderly and progressive future for that region opens one day only to be blocked the next by seemingly insurmountable obstacles. The problems of the Congolese transition are dumped suddenly on the United Nations to the tune of universal acclamation. Just as suddenly discordant notes are injected into the tune.

It is late in the day of this Congress to raise a question of this kind. I do so, however, because almost imperceptibly but deeply and rapidly, this Government is moving into involvement in the affairs of the Congo and Africa. Acts of the Senate are a factor in this trend in policy and, hence, the Senate shares responsibility for the form which the trend assumes. I would note in this connection that we have recently approved an increase in the President's contingency fund of \$100 million and that this amount was sought by him in

anticipation of needs in the Congo and elsewhere in Africa. Since we do have a responsibility, it behooves us to see as clearly as we are able the essentials of the situation which exists on the African Continent and to consider the course which we are pursuing.

Let me say at the outset that the conduct of African policy for the past few years by the President, the Secretary of State, and Mr. Lodge at the United Nations, in my opinion, deserves the support of the Senate. They have acted with insight and dispatch in dealing with a most uncertain situation.

It is no criticism of them to note that, of late, the waters of African affairs and particularly those in the Congo have become more turbulent.

What is taking place in the Congo may spread to other parts of the African Continent. Indeed, in the last few days the short-lived unity of Senegal and the Soudan Republic in the Mali Federation has threatened to come apart in factional dispute.

In short, we are likely to be in for a protracted period of difficulties in Africa. It is not easy to define the sources of these difficulties even though it is essential for the Senate to make the effort. Africa, from the point of view of our comprehension, is a new continent. It has burst upon our awareness suddenly, after having been shut off almost entirely by barriers of nature and the closed doors of colonial enclaves. What we need to know now for effective policies is not to be derived from the old travel books on Africa and the attitudes which they induced. It is the emergent Africa, the Africa of today and, even more important, the Africa of tomorrow which we must seek to fathom. For it is to this new Africa that we must address our policies.

It will be some time before the channels of objective information and skilled interpretation become fully adequate to this need. What pours out of Africa today is a confusing mixture of fact and fancy, of the sober and the sensational, of what is past and what is yet to be. However, there is a constant improvement in the flow of information as American reporters, writers and scholars converge on the African Continent and a network of American Embassies develops in the new Republics.

COLONIALISM

Some of the significant realities have already come into sharper focus. The first and most important of these is that European colonialism as a system of government is fast disappearing. At the end of World War II, there were four independent nations in Africa. Now, there are 24. By the end of the year, two more former colonies will become independent. Four African nations, including South Africa, signed the U.N. Charter in 1945. Ten African States are now members; 14 are likely to become members in the very near future.

It is clear that colonialism is rapidly disappearing as a political system in Africa. What is not so clear but what may be of even greater significance is that colonialism as a political propellant has not yet left the scene. The word

still has the capacity to evoke a militant nationalism, and even racism, in Africans. Its capacity in this respect may increase before it begins to decrease. That is likely to be the case so long as any part of the African Continent remains under alien jurisdiction. It is likely to be the case so long as any independent nation of Africa, now dominated by European settlers, has still to evolve a workable system of government under which the peoples of varying races can live together in a reasonable acceptance of one another. It is likely to be the case until a free Africa persuades itself that it is a full and equal participant in the general affairs of the world.

The persistence of this political propellant may or may not be valid in logic. What matters from the point of view of policy, however, is that it exists in fact and it is likely to continue to exist for some time. A policy which, in concept or administration, ignores its existence rests upon a most fragile foundation.

POLITICAL INSTABILITY

Beyond the persistence of the factor of colonialism, there are other political realities in the African situation with which our policies must reckon. It is now apparent that the stability of the colonial system was imposed from without at the price of a large measure of social atrophy within Africa. The basic mode of existence for great numbers of Africans today differs little from the pattern of an earlier time with its multiple tribes; multiple languages; multiple customs, values, and superstitions. Furthermore, the political boundaries which colonialism drew in Africa were more a consequence of power adjustments among the European nations rather than expressions of natural divisions and of human forces within Africa itself. Yet it is within these boundaries that African nations, today, are emerging into independence.

I do not make these observations in criticism. What is past is past and cannot be undone. I point to these factors because they are significant in the unstable situation with which our policies must deal during this period of transition in Africa. There will be strong pressures to pull apart the outwardly imposed political unities and to revert to the schismatic earlier pattern. The sophisticated nationalism of a handful of African leaders will not easily be transferred to the many. These leaders themselves will have to search for ways to reorder boundaries into new political units, knowing as they do the requirements for a durable statehood in the modern world. To a considerable extent this search can be fruitful and beneficial. Other consequences, however, may also be anticipated if the search becomes aggressive or if African leaders pursue concepts of pan-Africanism on the basis of a militant racism.

AFRICAN LEADERSHIP AND MODERN SKILLS

That brings me, Mr. President, to still another significant factor in the African situation with which we must deal in policy. To a degree perhaps unparalleled since the revolutions of independence in the Americas, the great political transition in Africa depends upon a

August 29

16886

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

handful of trained and experienced leaders. And unlike the simple world of the Americas at an earlier time, Africa is being propelled, in independence, into the modern world of instant communications, missiles, nuclear power and complex bureaucratic organization.

Few Africans have been introduced as apprentices and, even fewer as managerial participants in the affairs of the modern state, the modern economy, and the modern world. Yet many must learn rapidly if, to the bare bones of independence, there is to be added the sinews of economic and political organization which will give that independence beneficial meaning and durability for the people of Africa. The problem is not simply one of replacing the European colonial bureaucracies, with U.N. or other bureaucracies and, then, with an African bureaucracy in the same form. However much replacements of this kind may be unavoidable for the present, the deeper problem is the development of responsible African government and responsible African management to guide the African peoples into a way of life suited to their needs and, at the same time, capable of peaceful, free and constructive cooperation in the general progress of mankind.

The task which confronts an emerging Africa is monumental. Much will depend on an understanding and patient hand from the rest of the world. But even more will depend upon the dedication, the wisdom and the realistic restraint of those few Africans who are now assuming the reins of political power. They, more than anyone else, will make the decisions which set the patterns, for better or for worse, for the new way of life in Africa.

OUTSIDE INFLUENCES

I turn now, Mr. President, to the last significant factor in the African situation with which I wish to deal at this time. I have already noted that Africa's future is partially dependent on an understanding and patient assist from the rest of the world. There appears to be a great, a universal eagerness to lend a hand in Africa. We see it clearly in the Soviet Union and China. We see it clearly in Cairo. We see it clearly in Europe. We see it clearly in this country and in the United Nations.

What we do not yet see clearly is the nature of this hand. Certainly there is a human and sincere desire—and I am sure it exists among the people of all countries—to help those who for too long have been cut off from equal participation in the mainstream of human civilization. But is that all there is in the extended hands? Is there not also a certain eagerness to project into Africa the many ramifications of the cold war and other power rivalries which now plague the rest of the world?

The field is wide open for that game at the moment. Africa is in transition and its leadership has only limited experience. But transitions are not forever and those who have learned the way to national independence are equipped to learn other matters. Most important, I believe the emerging African peoples have had enough of the role of pawns

moved on the chessboards of others. They will not meekly assume that role again and they will react against those who seek to return them to it.

It may be too much to expect but it is not too much to attempt to insulate an emergent Africa from the international, political, and ideological storms which now sweep the rest of the world. In any event, I believe that policies, in concept or administration, which deliberately seek to project these storms into Africa will redound neither to the benefit of the African nations nor even to the long-range interests of those nations which pursue them.

THE SITUATION IN THE CONGO

The factors which I have been discussing and with which our policies respecting Africa must contend are to be found to a greater or lesser degree throughout that continent. And they are of intense significance in the immediate crisis in the Congo. The propellant of colonialism still drives people in that region to militant action despite the fact that independence has been achieved, despite the fact that the Belgians are in rapid withdrawal as U.N. forces enter the situation. Furthermore, as the colonial system has been progressively dismantled, the outward political unity which this system created faces rising centrifugal pressures, not only in Katanga and Kasai but elsewhere in that huge land. Also in evidence in the Congo is the counter-groping of pan-Africanism to which I have already alluded; unfortunately, I may add, it has already taken on some dangerous racial overtones in the expression of differing attitudes toward U.N. forces supplied by African nations and those from elsewhere. In the Congo, too, is to be found an enormous gap between the immediate need for skilled Africans in government and management and the extremely limited supply. In the Congo, finally, we see the helping hand from the rest of the world extended in sincere understanding of the difficulties confronting this new nation but also with the muscles of the external power-rivalries flexing here and there in an eagerness to plunge into the inviting situation.

U.S. INTERESTS

If we are to deal effectively in policy not only with the situation in the Congo but, in truth, with developments throughout Africa, we must not only see our interests clearly but we must pursue those interests in the light of significant factors of the kind I have been discussing today. Our interests are not hard to define. They arise, first and foremost from the universal implications of the historic American doctrines of freedom. And men and women in Africa, today, are striving for freedom and its meaning for them. They may struggle awkwardly and ineptly, perhaps, and sometimes even blindly but, nevertheless, the struggle is authentic.

Furthermore, American citizens have modest, cultural and commercial ties with Africa and the prospects for the improvement of the ties are good as Africa develops in freedom. These, too, constitute American interests.

Finally, we have an interest in human progress in peace in Africa. We have that interest in part because we cannot, and no people worthy of the name human can, close eyes to the desperate travails of a vast segment of the human family. We have it, too, because the peaceful progress of Africa is interrelated with the peace of the people of this Nation in this second half of the 20th century. We have this interest because if Africa can progress in freedom and peace, it will spare us the extension of the costly trappings of the cold war to still another continent.

FRAMEWORK FOR U.S. POLICY

What, then, do these interests suggest as a proper course of policy for this Nation? I do not believe that they suggest that we plunge headlong into the turbulent troubles of Africa with eager dollars, with unsolicited advice, with an indiscriminate outpouring of new military and economic aid programs wherever takers may be found. It should be obvious, now, on the basis of experience elsewhere that this approach can guarantee neither to dispel Africa's troubles nor to exorcise communism from that continent. Equally, Mr. President, we must resist the easy temptation to pass off the difficulties in Africa as of little import to this Nation. In short, our important but limited interests suggests that we do not assume the role of either first or last among equals in our approach to Africa but that we take our place as true equals among outsiders while Africa develops within, under its own leadership and in accord with its own genius. This view presupposes a major effort of assistance by the United Nations, as Africans need it, seek it, and can use it. But I hasten to add that that supposition is not the same as the glib slogan: "Let the United Nations do it."

With all due respect to Mr. Hammarskjöld, a brilliant and dedicated man, the fact is that what needs to be done in Africa will not be done unless the policies of this Government and others and, most of all, the leadership of the new Africa permit it to be done.

PRINCIPLES OF A UNITED STATES POLICY ON AFRICA

We cannot answer for others in this connection, but we can look to our own policies on Africa and their administration. In the light of the analysis which I have attempted today, I would suggest that our policies must flow from the following principles:

First. This Nation should give its support, diplomatically and otherwise, to the end that independence and human equality will eventually be achieved throughout Africa. Our support must go, as it has begun to go under this administration, to those who work soberly in Africa for these ends. May I say, in all candor, that this principle grows easier to maintain with consistency and dynamism as the nations of Europe with whom we are associated in other matters increasingly espouse it in their own African policies. The difficulties, however, are great and will remain great in these areas in Africa of heavy European settle-